

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. Claims 13, 16, and 18 are amended. The Examiner's reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Jun [U.S. Pat. No. 6,040,882], for the reasons set forth in pages 2-5 of the Office Action.

It is respectfully submitted that Jun does not disclose, *a compensating wiring that is electrically connected to the switching device*, as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner contends that the common electrode 100 and TFT 110a in Fig. 2 of Jun respectively disclose the claimed compensating wire and switching device.

However, the common electrode 100 is not connected to TFT 110a. For example, Fig. 3 of Jun illustrates that the common electrode 110a is bounded by an insulating layer 110 and a transparent substrate 200. Further, there is no connection illustrated in Fig. 3 between the common electrode 110a and either a source or drain electrode (e.g., elements 60a and 70a) of TFT 110a.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Jun fails to disclose claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Jun. Claim 4 is believed to be patentable over Jun for at least similar reasons to claim 1. For example, claim 4 recites, "*a compensating wiring that is electrically connected to the first switching*".

Claims 2-3 and 5-10 are believed to be patentable over Jun at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 4.

35 U.S.C. 103

(1) Claims 11-13, 15, 16, 18, 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun in view of Katase [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0008898].

The 103 rejection of claim 11 is premised, in part, on the Examiner's reliance on Jun as disclosing "*a compensating wiring that is electrically connected to the switching device*".

However, Jun fails to disclose "*a compensating wiring that is electrically connected to the switching device*", for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 1. The deficiencies of Jun in this regard are not cured by Katase. For example, FIG. 3 of Katase merely illustrates that TFT 103 is connected to a data line, a scanning line, and a pixel electrode 104. Further, there is no disclosure elsewhere in Katase of a compensating wire being connected to TFT 103.

Claim 12 is believed to be patentable over Jun and Katase for reasons similar to claim 11. For example, claim 11 recites "*a compensating wiring that is electrically connected to the first switching device*".

It is further respectfully submitted that Jun and Katase, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, *a source electrode of the second switching device being electrically connected to a drain electrode of the first switching device*, as recited in amended claim 13.

The Examiner contends that FIG. 2 of Jun discloses the claimed first and second switching devices as elements 110a and 110b.

However, as opposed to amended claim 13, Jun merely teaches two switching devices that are electrically connected to each other through a display signal line. For

example, Jun teaches (in FIG. 2 and col. 4, line 45-col. 5, lines 2) that the drain electrodes (60a and 60b) of the two thin film transistors 110a and 110b are connected to each other through display signal line 50a.

It is further respectfully submitted that Jun and Katase, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, *a transmissive electrode that is electrically connected to the switching device, a reflective electrode that is electrically connected to the transmissive electrode*, as recited in amended claim 16.

The Examiner respectively interprets pixel electrodes 40a and 40b in FIG. 2 of Jun as the claimed transmissive and reflective electrodes.

However, as opposed to amended claim 16, pixel electrode 40b is not electrically connected to pixel electrode 40a. For example, FIG. 2 of Jun merely illustrates a connection between pixel electrode 40b and TFT 110b, but no connection between pixel electrode 40b and pixel electrode 40a.

It is further respectfully submitted that Jun and Katase, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, *a second substrate including a plurality of common electrodes, formed from a same layer and separated from each other, each of the common electrodes corresponding to each of the pixel electrodes*, as recited in amended claim 18.

The Examiner concedes that Jun does not disclose a second substrate. The Examiner instead relies on Katase as disclosing the claimed second substrate and contends that common electrode 202 in FIG. 2 of Katase discloses the claimed plurality of common electrodes.

However, as opposed to amended claim 18, Katase merely teaches (in FIG. 2) a dispersion medium 2 composed of an additive such as a surface-active agent, a sealer 202, and a single common electrode 201 formed on the sealer 202. The common electrode 202 is a single contiguous unit with no separations, which is clearly different from a plurality of common electrodes that are separated from one another.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 11, 12, 13, 16, and 18 are believed to be patentable over the combination of Jun and Katase.

Claims 12, 15, and 19 are believed to be patentable over the combination of Jun and Katase at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 11, 13, and 18.

(2) Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun in view of Katase, and in further view of Park [U.S. Pat. Pub. 20030020853], for the reasons set forth in pages 9-10 of the Office action.

The above 103 rejection (i.e., 2) is premised, in part, on the Examiner's reliance on the combination of Jun and Katase as disclosing all elements of claim 16 from which claim 17 depends. However, said combination does not disclose or suggest *a transmissive electrode that is electrically connected to the switching device, a reflective electrode that is electrically connected to the transmissive electrode* for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 16. Further, the deficiencies of Jun and Katase in this regard are not cured by Park. For example, Park merely teaches (in FIG. 4 and paragraphs 33-34) a transparent pixel electrode 163, but not a reflective electrode. Further, even assuming *arguendo*, that the reflective plate 172 were interpreted as a reflective electrode, the reflective plate merely overlaps with, but does not connect to the transparent electrode 163.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of Jun, Katase, and Park fails to disclose or suggest claim 17.

(3) Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun in view of Katase, and in further view of Tsunoda [U.S. Pat. Pub. 20030164500] for the reasons set forth in pages 10-11 of the Office Action.

The above 103 rejection (i.e., 3) is premised, in part, on the Examiner's reliance on Jun and Katase as disclosing all elements of claim 13 from which claim 14 depends. However, said combination does not disclose or suggest *a source electrode of the second switching device being electrically connected to a drain electrode of the first switching device*, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13. Further, the deficiencies of Jun and Katase in this regard are not cured by Tsunoda. While FIG. 4 of Tsunoda illustrates TFTs 202, 203, 204 and 205, there is no disclosure in Tsunoda of a source electrode of one TFT being connected to a drain electrode of another TFT.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of Jun, Katase, and Tsunoda fails to disclose or suggest claim 14.

(4) Claims 20-21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun in view of Katase, and in further view of Shin [U.S. Pat. 6,549,258], for the reasons set forth by the Examiner in pages 11-12 of the Office Action.

The above 103 rejection (i.e., 4) is premised, in part, on the Examiner's reliance on Jun and Katase as disclosing all elements of claim 18 from which claims 20-21 depends. However, said combination does not disclose or suggest *a second substrate including a plurality of common electrodes, formed from a same layer and separated from each other, each of the common electrodes corresponding to each of the pixel*

electrodes for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 18. Further, the deficiencies of Jun and Katase in this regard are not cured by Shin.

Withdrawal of the above obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Robert Newman

Robert J. Newman
Reg. No. 60,718
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
Telephone: (516) 692-8888
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889